

Gauge Optimization via ADMM for Approximate Inference

Sungsoo Ahn

*School of Electrical Engineering,
Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology
Daejeon, Korea*

SUNGSOO.AHN@KAIST.AC.KR

Michael Chertkov

¹*Theoretical Division, T-4 & Center for Nonlinear Studies,
Los Alamos National Laboratory
Los Alamos, NM 87545, USA*
²*Skolkovo Institute of Science and Technology,
143026 Moscow, Russia*

CHERTKOV@LANL.GOV

Jinwoo Shin

*School of Electrical Engineering,
Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology
Daejeon, Korea*

JINWOOS@KAIST.AC.KR

Abstract

Computing partition function is the most important inference task arising in applications of Graphical Models (GM). Since it is computationally intractable, approximate algorithms are used to tackle the problem. In this paper, by relying on the technique, coined gauge transformation, modifying GM factors such that the partition function stay the same (invariant), we propose two optimization formulations which generalize the Bethe Free Energy, Belief Propagation approach. Then, we show that the optimizations can be solved efficiently by Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers (ADMM) algorithms. Our first algorithm provides deterministic lower bounds of the partition function. The algorithm is exact for GMs over a single loop with a special structure, even though the popular Belief Propagation algorithm performs badly in this case. Our second algorithm is of a randomized, Monte Carlo, type. It lowers sample variance, which can be further reduced with the help of annealed/sequential/adaptive importance sampling. The experiments show that the newly proposed Gauge-ADMM algorithms outperform other known algorithms for the approximate inference task.

1. Introduction

Graphical Models (GM) express factorization of the joint multivariate probability distributions in statistics via graph of relations between variables. The concept of GM has been used successfully in information theory Gallager (1962); Kschischang and Frey (1998), physics Bethe (1935); Peierls (1936); Mézard et al. (1987); Parisi (1988); Mezard and Montanari (2009), artificial intelligence Pearl (2014), and machine learning Jordan (1998); Freeman et al. (2000). Of many inference problems one can formulate for a GM, computing the partition function (normalization), or equivalently marginalizing the joint distribution, is the most general problem of interest. However, this paradigmatic problem is known to be computationally intractable in general, i.e., formally it is #P-hard even to approximate Jerrum and Sinclair (1993).

Therefore, researchers have focused mainly on practical, approximation algorithms, deterministic and randomized. Belief Propagation (BP) algorithm Pearl (1982) is arguably the most popular deterministic algorithm. Typically, BP is fast, very successful in practice, even though it is a heuristic lacking accuracy control for loop graphs. This motivated researchers to develop rigorous techniques, in particular providing lower bounds Parisi (1988); Dechter and Rish (2003); Liu and Ihler (2012); Ermon et al. (2012) and upper bounds Wainwright et al. (2005); Wiegand (2005); Globerson and Jaakkola (2007); Liu and Ihler (2011); Ermon et al. (2012) for the partition function of a general GM. On the other hand, randomized methods, dated

backed to the seminal “Monte Carlo” (MC) paper Metropolis and Ulam (1949), are statistically exact, i.e., providing sufficiently accurate estimation with high probability if the number of samples is large enough. However, typically the number of required samples scales badly in vanilla MC, prompting development of a number of significant, and often complimentary improvements based on ideas such as simulated annealing Kirkpatrick et al. (1983), importance sampling Marshall (1954), adaptive importance sampling Owen and Zhou (2000), as well as synthesis of annealing and importance sampling Neal (2001) aimed at lowering variance in the partition function estimations. See, e.g. Liu (2008) for recent review and detailed references.

In another line of research, which this paper continues, the so-called Re-Parametrizations Wainwright et al. (2003), Gauge Transformations (GT) Chertkov and Chernyak (2006a,b) and Holographic Transformations Valiant (2008); Al-Bashabsheh and Mao (2011) were explored. This class of different, but related, transformations modifies a GM by changing factors continuously, associated with elements of the graph such that the partition function stays the same/invariant.¹ In this paper, we consider GT as the most general one among the three. Once applied to a GM, GT transforms the original partition function, defined as a weighted sum/series over states, to a new series, dependent on the choice of gauges. For example, BP fixed points can also be understood as an optimal GT Chertkov and Chernyak (2006a,b); Chernyak and Chertkov (2007); Mori (2015) in the spirit of Yedidia et al. (2005), results in the so-called Loop Series Chertkov and Chernyak (2006a,b). This paper explores a more general class of GT and develops a new gauge-optimization approach which results in a ‘better’ approximate inference than one provided by BP and other related methods.

Contribution. First, we optimize GT to obtain a ‘good’ lower bound on the partition function. Our approach is motivated by the fact, mentioned above, that BP-gauge allows an optimization interpretation. We modify the BP-optimization of Chertkov and Chernyak (2006a,b); Chernyak and Chertkov (2007); Mori (2015) by adding constraints which guarantees that all terms in the resulting series for the partition function are non-negative. Consequently, the modified optimization always outputs a lower bound on the partition function. We also prove that it is exact for GMs defined over single cycles, which we coin ‘alternating cycle/loop’, as well as line graphs. The alternative cycle case is surprising as it is nothing but the simplest ‘counter-example’ from Weller et al. (2014) showing failure of BP.

Second, we optimize GT to design a ‘sample-efficient’ MC method. Specifically, we utilize GT to modify the original distribution such that the cross-entropy Rubinstein (1997) between the sampling distribution and the gauge-corrected distribution is minimized, while keeping the partition function invariant. This approach optimizes a new degree of freedom (the gauge) within a MC method, thus allowing to reduce sample variance by enhancing (and not just substituting) other annealed/sequential/adaptive importance sampling methods discussed in the literature Marshall (1954); Owen and Zhou (2000); Neal (2001); Liu (2008). Indeed, optimization over gauges allows to improve the ‘target function’ while the traditional methods optimize the shape of the sampling distribution. Therefore, it is advantageous to utilize these complementary approaches in combination. We experiment such a synthesis, as reported in Section 5. We also provide a tight characterization of GT which can guide the choice of ‘good’ sampling distributions within the optimization framework.

Summarizing our contributions discussed so far, we have proposed two GT optimization schemes for deterministic and randomized approximate inferences. The resulting optimizations are (naturally) not convex which lead us, first, to empirical validation with non-convex heuristics via the combination of Julia jul, JuMP JuM and IPOPT Ipo. Then, aiming to improve the performance, we re-cast the GT optimizations in the Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers (ADMM) Gabay and Mercier (1976) format. Our choice of ADMM was encouraged by its recent successes in applications to non-convex optimization problems, e.g., see Bento et al. (2013), and also by the fact that the ADMM convergence has been established even for non-convex and non-smooth functions Wang et al. (2015). Therefore, our third contribution consists in developing an efficient, BP-like, ADMM algorithms to solve the gauge-optimization problems introduced above over sparse graphs. Our experiments show that the proposed ADMM-based algorithms, which we coin Gauge-ADMMs, outperform other approximate inference algorithms.

1. See Wainwright and Jordan (2008); Forney Jr and Vontobel (2011); Chertkov (2016) for discussions of relations between the aforementioned techniques.

Note that all statements of the paper are made within the framework of the so-called Forney-style GMs Forney (2001) which is general as allowing interactions beyond pair-wise (i.e., high-order GM) and including other/alternative GM formulations, e.g. factor graph formulation Wainwright and Jordan (2003).

Organization. In Section 2, we introduce necessary backgrounds for GM and GT. The two gauge-optimization formulations and the corresponding ADMM solvers are presented in Section 3 and Section 4, respectively. The experimental results are reported in Section 5.

2. Preliminaries

2.1 Graphical model

Factor-graph model. Given (undirected) bipartite factor graph $G = (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{E})$, a joint distribution of (binary) random variables $x = [x_v \in \{0, 1\} : v \in \mathcal{X}]$ is called a factor-graph Graphical Model (GM) if it factorizes as follows:

$$p(x) = \frac{1}{Z} \prod_{\alpha \in \mathcal{F}} f_{\alpha}(x_{\partial\alpha}),$$

where f_{α} are some non-negative functions called factor functions, $\partial\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ denotes the neighboring vertices of α and the normalization constant

$$Z := \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^{\mathcal{X}}} \prod_{\alpha \in \mathcal{F}} f_{\alpha}(x_{\partial\alpha})$$

is called the partition function.

A factor-graph GM is called pair-wise if $|\partial\alpha| \leq 2$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}$, and high-order, otherwise. It is known that even approximating the partition function is #P-hard even for pair-wise GMs in general Jerrum and Sinclair (1993).

Forney-style model. In this paper, we primarily use the Forney-style GM Forney (2001) instead of factor-graph GM. Elementary random variables in the Forney-style GM are associated with edges of an undirected graph, $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$. Random vector, $x = [x_{ab} \in \{0, 1\} : (a, b) \in \mathcal{E}]$ is realized with the probability distribution

$$p(x) = \frac{1}{Z} \prod_{a \in V} f_a(x_a), \quad (1)$$

where x_a is a random vector constructed from the components of the full random vector, x , associated with edges neighboring node a , i.e. $x_a = [x_{ab}, b \in \partial a]$ and

$$Z := \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^{\mathcal{E}}} \prod_{a \in V} f_a(x_a). \quad (2)$$

As argued in Chertkov and Chernyak (2006a,b), the Forney-style GM constitutes a more universal and compact description of gauge transformations without any restriction of generality. Namely, given any factor-graph GM on $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{E})$ with factors f_{α} , one can construct an equivalent Forney-style GM on $(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ with factors $f_a^{\dagger}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V} &\leftarrow \mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{F}, & f_{\alpha}^{\dagger} &\leftarrow f_{\alpha}, \quad \forall \alpha \in \mathcal{F}, \\ f_a^{\dagger}(x_a) &\leftarrow \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x_a = (1, 1, \dots) \text{ or } (0, 0, \dots) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad \forall a \in \mathcal{X}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, if the factor-graph GM (possibly, of high-order) is sparse, i.e., the maximum degree of $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{E})$ is small, then the equivalent Forney-style GM is too.

2.2 Gauge transformation

Gauge transformation (GT) Chertkov and Chernyak (2006a,b) is a family of linear transformations of the factor functions in (1) which leaves the the partition function Z , defined in (2), invariant. Consider an invertible 2×2 matrix G_{ab} for $(a, b) \in \mathcal{E}$:

$$G_{ab} = \begin{bmatrix} G_{ab}(0, 0) & G_{ab}(0, 1) \\ G_{ab}(1, 0) & G_{ab}(1, 1) \end{bmatrix}.$$

The gauge transformed GM with respect to $\mathcal{G} = [G_{ab}, G_{ba} : (a, b) \in \mathcal{E}]$ consists of factors expressed as:

$$f_{a,\mathcal{G}}(x_a) = \sum_{x'_a \in \{0,1\}^{|\partial a|}} f_a(x'_a) \prod_{b \in \partial a} G_{ab}(x_{ab}, x'_{ab}).$$

Moreover, each pair $\{G_{ab}, G_{ba}\}$ of conjugated matrices must satisfy the following Gauge constraint:

$$G_{ab}^\top G_{ba} = \mathbb{I}, \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbb{I}$ is the identity matrix. Then, one can prove that the partition function is invariant under the transformation:

$$Z = \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^{|\mathcal{E}|}} \prod_{a \in \mathcal{V}} f_a(x_a) = \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^{|\mathcal{E}|}} \prod_{a \in \mathcal{V}} f_{a,\mathcal{G}}(x_a). \quad (4)$$

Consequently, GT results in a transformed distribution $p_{\mathcal{G}}$ as follows:

$$p_{\mathcal{G}}(x) = \frac{1}{Z} \prod_{a \in \mathcal{V}} f_{a,\mathcal{G}}(x_a).$$

However, the above GM might not be a *valid* distribution if $p_{\mathcal{G}}(x) < 0$. Nevertheless, $p_{\mathcal{G}}$ is well defined.

Notice that GT of a single factor $f_a \rightarrow f_{a,\mathcal{G}}$ is equivalent to a widely used tensor operation applied on a tensor representing f_a Lim (2005). Especially, when $|\partial a| = 2$, i.e., f_a represents a matrix, the operation can be expressed as:

$$f_a \rightarrow f_{a,\mathcal{G}} = G_{ab}^\top f_a G_{ac},$$

where $\partial a = \{b, c\}$.

As stated in Chertkov and Chernyak (2006a,b), GT provides an interpretation of the popular BP algorithm Pearl (1982): fixed points of BP correspond to a special set of gauges which keeps an arbitrarily chosen configuration x to be least sensitive to the local variation of the gauge. In other words, BP-gauges correspond to stationary points of the following non-convex optimization:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} \quad \prod_{a \in \mathcal{V}} f_{a,\mathcal{G}}(0, 0, \dots) \\ & \text{subject to} \quad G_{ab}^\top G_{ba} = \mathbb{I}, \quad \forall (a, b) \in \mathcal{E}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

The optimal objective value of (5) corresponds to the Bethe approximation Yedidia et al. (2001) for the partition function Z .

3. Optimization for Deterministic Inference

The Bethe approximation computed for the BP gauges, or equivalently a solution of the optimization (5), estimates the partition function, however without providing any approximation guarantees unless G is a tree, i.e., a graph containing no loop. Note that in general, arbitrary choice of gauges does not guarantee non-negativity of all the terms on the rhs of (4), then the respective (negative) contributions cannot be interpreted as describing (yet not normalized) probabilities of the states. In this section, we first introduce a modified version of (5) which guarantees positivity of all the terms in the series and thus provides a lower bound on the exact partition function. Then, we describe how the newly introduced optimization can be solved via an algorithm of the Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers (ADMM) Gabay and Mercier (1976) type.

3.1 Optimization formulation

We aim to modify (5) to achieve the ‘best’ lower bound. The modification consists in imposing additional constraints which guarantees positivity of all the terms in the series on the rhs of (4). Formally, we consider the following optimization:

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\mathcal{G}}{\text{maximize}} && \sum_{a \in V} \ln f_{a,\mathcal{G}}(0, 0, \dots) \\ & \text{subject to} && G_{ab}^\top G_{ba} = \mathbb{I}, \quad \forall (a, b) \in \mathcal{E} \\ & && f_{a,\mathcal{G}}(x_a) \geq 0, \quad \forall a \in \mathcal{V}, \forall x_a \in \{0, 1\}^{\partial a}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

It is direct to check that the optimal solution of (6) guarantees (by construction) that the first term in the series on the rhs of (4) provides a lower bound on the exact partition function. An efficient solver for the optimization is provided in Section 3.2. In the remainder of this section, we, first comment on our choice of constraints in (6) and then present some examples helping us to understand limitations and advantages of the new formulation.

First of all, notice that the number of new constraints in (6) is linear in the number of vertices in G , while the total number of terms in the series on the rhs of (4) is exponential. Therefore, adding the exponential number of constraints (enforcing the positivity directly) would generate a tighter lower bound on the partition function, however it would jeopardize tractability. Second, even if we enforce positivity of each term in the series, it would still provide a (generally) loose lower bound on the partition function, as the condition is stronger than the one actually required for the lower bound, i.e., the sum of all terms except for the first one in the series is non-negative. In this context let us also mention a related discussion in the literature. It was shown in Sudderth et al. (2007) that the choice of BP-gauges guarantees the first term $\prod_{a \in V} f_{a,\mathcal{G}}(0, 0, \dots)$ in the series to provide a lower bound of the partition function in the case of attractive pair-wise GM with additional constraints on non-negativity of all other terms in the series. However, it was shown later in Ruozzi (2012) that the additional constraints are not required for BP to guarantee a lower bound of the partition function for the attractive pair-wise GMs.

Since the Bethe approximation, corresponding to solving (5), is exact on a tree graph, it is natural to expect that the optimization (6) is exact in this case as well. However, proving this statement is quite challenging since BP-gauges can violate the non-negative constraints of (6), and we leave it as a conjecture. Instead, we prove that the optimization (6) is exact in the case when G is a line (which is a special case of a tree), and somewhat surprisingly, that it is also exact when G is a single loop/cycle with odd number of factors represented by negative definite matrices. In fact, the latter case is the so-called ‘alternating cycle’ example which was introduced in Weller et al. (2014) as the simplest loopy example where BP performs quite badly. Formally, we state the following theorem.

Theorem 1 *For GM defined on any line graph or alternating cycle, the optimization (6) is exact, i.e. it outputs the exact log partition function $\ln Z$.*

Proof *First, we show that any GM defined on line graph can be turned into equivalent GM defined on alternating cycle. Consider a GM defined on some line graph $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ with $\mathcal{V} = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$ and edges $\mathcal{E} = \{a_1 a_2, a_2 a_3, \dots, a_{n-1} a_n\}$. Moreover, we use $f_1, \dots, f_n$ to denote factors representing each vertexes. Then gauge transformed factor $f_{a_i, \mathcal{G}}$ can be expressed as:*

$$f_{a_i, \mathcal{G}} = G_{a_i a_{i-1}}^\top f_{a_i} G_{a_i a_{i+1}},$$

because the size of the factor is 2. Notice that any line graph can ‘flip’ the factor f_2 via GT to result in odd number of negative definite factors among $f_2, \dots, f_{n-1}$, i.e., setting

$$G_{a_1 a_2}, G_{a_2 a_1} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

results in reversed sign of $\det(f_{a_2})$. If $\det(f_{a_2}) = 0$, we instead flip f_3 and so on. If all the factors are non-invertible, the proof is trivial. Next, we ‘join’ the endpoints a_1, a_n into a_0 via introducing a non-invertible

factor $f_0 = f_1 f_n^\top$, which results in an alternating cycle with identical distribution to the original line GM. Consequently, any set of gauges $\mathcal{G}^\dagger$ defined on the alternating cycle can be defined on the line graph as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} G_{a_i a_{i+1}} &\leftarrow G_{a_i a_{i+1}}^\dagger, G_{a_{i+1} a_i} \leftarrow G_{a_{i+1} a_i}^\dagger \quad \forall i = 2, 3, n-2, \\ G_{a_1 a_2} &\leftarrow G_{a_0 a_2}^\dagger, \quad G_{a_2 a_1} \leftarrow G_{a_2 a_0}^\dagger, \quad G_{a_{n-1} a_n} \leftarrow G_{a_{n-1} a_n}^\dagger, \quad G_{a_n a_{n-1}} \leftarrow G_{a_0 a_{n-1}}^\dagger. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, proving Theorem 1 only for alternating cycle is sufficient.

Now consider an alternating cycle defined on some graph $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ with $\mathcal{V} = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$ and edges $\mathcal{E} = \{a_1 a_2, a_2 a_3, \dots, a_{n-1} a_n, a_n a_1\}$. Moreover, we use $f_1, \dots, f_n$ to denote factors representing each vertexes. Consequently, $\prod_i f_{a_i, \mathcal{G}}$ and $\prod_i f_{a_i}$ share the pair of eigenvalues λ_1, λ_2 due to

$$\prod_i f_{a_i, \mathcal{G}} = G_{a_n a_1}^{-1} \prod_i f_i G_{a_n a_1}$$

by the gauge constraint on conjugate matrices. One observes that $\lambda_1 \lambda_2 = \prod \det(f_i) \leq 0$ since there exist an odd number of negative definite factors in the cycle. Moreover, $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 > 0$ since diagonal sum of $\prod_i f_i$ is equivalent to the partition function of GM. We may assume $\lambda_1 > 0$ and $\lambda_2 < 0$ without loss of generality.

Next, utilizing a simple linear algebra, one derives

$$Q_2^{-1} Q_1 G_{a_n a_1} \prod_i f_{a_i, \mathcal{G}} Q_1^{-1} Q_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 & \lambda_1 \\ -\lambda_2 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where Q_1 and Q_2 are matrices whose j -th column is an eigenvector of $\prod_i f_i$ and $\begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 & \lambda_1 \\ -\lambda_2 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ respectively. Now let

$$G_{a_n a_1} = Q_1^{-1} Q_2, \quad G_{a_{i-1} a_i} = (f_i G_{a_i a_{i+1}}^\top)^{-1} \quad \text{for } i = 2, \dots, n,$$

where $a_{n+1} = a_1$. Here we assume that there exists at most one non-invertible factor in the GM and $f_2, \dots, f_n$ are invertible so that $(f_i G_{a_i a_{i+1}}^\top)^{-1}$ is defined properly. Otherwise, the GM can be decomposed into separate line graphs and the proof can be applied recursively. Then the gauge transformed factors become:

$$f_{a_1, \mathcal{G}} = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 & \lambda_1 \\ -\lambda_2 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad f_{a_i, \mathcal{G}} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \forall i \neq 1,$$

which corresponds to a GM with objective of (6) equal to the log partition function. This completes the proof of Theorem 1. $\blacksquare$

3.2 Algorithm design

In this section, we describe an efficient ADMM-based algorithm for solving the optimization (6). To this end, we first reformulate it:

$$\begin{aligned} &\underset{\mathcal{G}}{\text{minimize}} && \sum_{a \in \mathcal{V}} g_a(\mathcal{G}_a) \\ &\text{subject to} && c(\mathcal{G}) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

where we let $\mathcal{G}_a = \{G_{ab}\}_{b \in \partial a}$. The objective is expressed as a summation of non-smooth functions

$$g_a(\mathcal{G}_a) := \begin{cases} -\ln f_{a, \mathcal{G}}(0, 0, \dots) & \text{if } f_{a, \mathcal{G}}(x_a) \geq 0, \quad \forall x_a \in \{0, 1\}^{\partial a} \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and the constraint is represented by the following vector

$$c(\mathcal{G}) = [c_{ab}(x_{ab}, x'_{ab}) : x_{ab}, x'_{ab}, (a, b) \in E],$$

where

$$c_{ab}(x_{ab}, x'_{ab}) := \sum_{x_{ab}^\dagger \in \{0,1\}} G_{ab}(x_{ab}, x_{ab}^\dagger) G_{ba}(x'_{ab}, x_{ab}^\dagger) - \mathbb{I}(x_{ab}, x'_{ab}).$$

Then, the respective augmented Lagrangian becomes

$$L_\rho(\mathcal{G}; y) = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{V}} g_a(\mathcal{G}_a) + y^\top c(\mathcal{G}) + (\rho/2) \|c(\mathcal{G})\|_2^2,$$

where y is the augmented Lagrangian multiplier, and ρ is the non-negative penalty parameter. Now we are ready to apply the following ADMM algorithm, noticeably with non-smooth objectives and non-linear constraints to solving (6).

Algorithm 1 Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers

input GM defined over graph $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ with $n = |\mathcal{V}|$ and factors $\{f_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{V}}$.

```

1: repeat
2:   for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$  do
3:      $\mathcal{G}_{a_i}^{(k,i)} \leftarrow [\mathcal{G}_{a_1}^{(k+1)}, \dots, \mathcal{G}_{a_{i-1}}^{(k+1)}, \mathcal{G}_{a_{i+1}}^{(k)}, \dots, \mathcal{G}_{a_n}^{(k)}]$ 
4:      $\mathcal{G}_{a_i}^{(k+1)} \leftarrow \arg \min_{\mathcal{G}_{a_i}} L_\rho(\mathcal{G}^{(k,i)}, \mathcal{G}_{a_i}; y)$ 
5:   end for
6:    $y^{k+1} \leftarrow y^k - \rho \cdot c(\mathcal{G}^{(k+1)})$ 
7: until stopping criterion is met

```

output Set of gauges $\mathcal{G}$.

In the above algorithm, each subroutine which requires solving the optimization $\arg \min_{\mathcal{G}_a} L_\rho(\mathcal{G}^{(k,i)}, \mathcal{G}_a; y)$ can be reformulated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \underset{\mathcal{G}}{\text{minimize}} && -\ln f_{a,\mathcal{G}}(0, 0, \dots) + y_a^\top c(\mathcal{G}_a) + \sum_{a \in \mathcal{V}} (\rho/2) \|c(\mathcal{G}_a)\|_2^2 \\
& \text{subject to} && f_{a,\mathcal{G}}(x_a) \geq 0, \quad \forall x_a \in \{0, 1\}^{\partial a}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the number of variables involving in this optimization is $2^{|\partial a|}$, which is a small number for sparse GMs. Hence, the ADMM formulation allows to apply efficient non-linear optimization tools for solving each subroutine. In our experiments reported in Section 5, we use the IPOPT solver Wächter and Biegler (2006) for this purpose.

Finally, let us describe a simple trick which allows to improve the output quality of **Algorithm 1**. Recall that it maximizes and outputs a single configuration $\prod_a f_{a,\mathcal{G}}(0, 0, \dots)$. However, one can also consider using multiple configurations, which is always better as it brings us closer to the true log partition function through respective reinforcement of non-negative constraints. For example, in the case of a single factor a with $|\partial a| = 2$,

$$\ln f_{a,\mathcal{G}}(0, 0) \tag{7}$$

$$\leq \ln (f_{a,\mathcal{G}}(0, 0) + f_{a,\mathcal{G}}(0, 1)) \tag{8}$$

$$\leq \ln (f_{a,\mathcal{G}}(0, 0) + f_{a,\mathcal{G}}(0, 1) + f_{a,\mathcal{G}}(1, 0)) \tag{9}$$

$$\leq \ln (f_{a,\mathcal{G}}(0, 0) + f_{a,\mathcal{G}}(0, 1) + f_{a,\mathcal{G}}(1, 0) + f_{a,\mathcal{G}}(1, 1)) \tag{10}$$

$$= \ln Z.$$

One might maximize multiple configurations (8), (9) or (10) instead of (7). However, with this choice the objective is no longer separable and thus quite challenging to design an efficient algorithm such as **Algorithm 1**. Nevertheless, one may force **Algorithm 1** to output (8), (9) or (10) instead of (7), while keeping the same optimization procedures over $\mathcal{G}$. This approach always improves performance of **Algorithm 1**. However, in general, there exist exponentially many $2^{|\mathcal{E}|}$ configurations and one has to choose only a few of them. In our experiments, we choose to consider the ‘near zero configurations’ which have Hamming distances to $(0, 0, \dots)$ bounded by some $k \geq 0$, i.e., $O(|\mathcal{E}|^k)$ configurations in total. For example of the single factor case mentioned above, (9) corresponds to the case $k = 1$. This choice is based on the intuition that configurations partially different from $(0, 0, \dots)$ may be significant too as they share most of the same factor values with the zero configuration maximized by **Algorithm 1**.

4. Optimization for Randomized Inference

The deterministic inference algorithms, e.g., BP, are typically fast, however in general lack control of accuracy. Instead, randomized algorithm of the Monte Carlo type offers an alternative which is asymptotically exact when the number of sample goes to infinity. In this section, we show how to optimize gauges to design ‘sample-efficient’ Monte Carlo methods. Our presentation scheme remains similar to the previous section - we first state the task of finding sample-efficient gauges as an optimization problem and then describe respective ADMM-style algorithmic implementation.

4.1 Optimization formulation

First, we describe a vanilla importance sampling scheme for estimating the partition function. Let us rewrite the partition function as an expectation over yet to defined distribution $q(x)$ on $\{0, 1\}^{\mathcal{E}}$

$$Z = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim q} \left[\frac{\prod_{a \in \mathcal{V}} f_a(x_a)}{q(x)} \right]. \quad (11)$$

Note that $q(x)$ might not correspond to any GM. An empirical s -samples Monte Carlo (MC) estimate of (11) is

$$\hat{Z} = \frac{1}{s} \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{\prod_{a \in \mathcal{V}} f_a(x_a^{(i)})}{q(x^{(i)})},$$

where $x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}, \dots, x^{(s)}$ are sampled from $q(x)$. It is straightforward to check that the optimal number of samples is achieved when $q(x) \propto \prod_{a \in \mathcal{V}} f_a(x_a)$. However, since direct sampling from $p(x)$ is hard one is looking for $q(x)$ which is sufficiently close (but not equal) to $p(x)$ and also easy to sample from.

To achieve this goal, we suggest to optimize gauges $\mathcal{G}$ and design a new distribution $p_{\mathcal{G}}(x)$ from the original one $p(x)$ so that the cross-entropy between the two distributions, $p_{\mathcal{G}}(x)$ and $q(x)$, is minimized while keeping the partition function invariant. Choosing the Kullback-Leibler measure to compare the probability distributions, $D_{\text{KL}}(p_{\mathcal{G}} \parallel q)$, we thus arrive at the following optimization:

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\mathcal{G}}{\text{minimize}} \quad & - \sum_{a \in \mathcal{V}} \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^{|\partial a|}} q(x_a) \ln f_{a,\mathcal{G}}(x_a) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & G_{ab}^{\top} G_{ba} = \mathbb{I}, \quad \forall (a, b) \in E, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where $q(x_a)$ is the marginal distribution on x_a . One can easily check that the gauge-transformed GM $p_{\mathcal{G}}$ obtained by solving the above optimization is always valid, i.e., $p_{\mathcal{G}}(x) \geq 0$ for all x , as long as $q(x)$ has the full support, i.e., $q(x) > 0$ for all x .

Note that even though we mention (so far in this section) only vanilla importance sampling, the gauge optimization (12) can obviously be extended to work in combination with any of the advanced MC implementations, e.g., of the annealed/sequential/adaptive importance sampling type Neal (2001); Liu (2008); Marshall (1954). In this regards, let us mention that our optimization strategy is similar to that of the adaptive

importance sampling in the sense that both suggest to minimize the cross entropy between two distributions. However, in the case of adaptive importance sampling $q(x)$ is the optimization variable, while in the proposal of (12) one optimizes over gauges, parameterizing $p_G(x)$. Hence, this suggests to run the advanced MC on the gauge-transformed GM for utilizing the orthogonal benefits of two approaches, as we describe in Section 5. Or, one can synthesize them by optimizing over $q(x)$ and gauges in parallel, which might be more advantageous.

Finally, we also remark that (12) is equivalent to (5) of BP-gauges, if the sampling distribution $q(x)$ is nonzero (unity) only at the all-zero configuration, i.e., $q(0, 0, \dots) = 1$. This means that the gauge-optimized sampling method proposed above becomes exactly equivalent, under this very special (singular) choice of $q(x)$, to the recent MC method in Ahn et al. (2016).

4.2 Algorithm design

In this section, we describe again an efficient algorithm of the ADMM type for solving the optimization (12). However, instead of formulating the ADMM algorithm straight for (12), we modify the optimization adding the following constraints:

$$\det(G_{ab}) = 1, \det(G_{ba}) = 1, \quad \forall (a, b) \in \mathcal{E}, \quad (13)$$

where $\det(\cdot)$ denotes the matrix determinant. As we see below, these constraint does not alter the optimization task, however brings in a significant benefit of making other constraints in (12) linear. To verify legitimacy of (13), one simply observes that (12) is invariant under the transformation

$$G_{ab}(0, \cdot) \rightarrow \frac{1}{\det(G_{ab})} G_{ab}(0, \cdot), \quad G_{ba}(0, \cdot) \rightarrow \frac{1}{\det(G_{ba})} G_{ba}(0, \cdot).$$

Notice, however, that these rescaling transformations cannot be applied to the deterministic optimization (6).

Now we are ready to reformulate the optimization (12):

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\mathcal{G}}{\text{minimize}} && \sum_{a \in \mathcal{V}} g_a(\mathcal{G}_a) \\ & \text{subject to} && c(\mathcal{G}) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the objective is expressed as the following sum of the following (non-smooth) functions

$$g_a(\mathcal{G}_a) := \begin{cases} -\sum_{x_a \in \{0,1\}^{|\partial a|}} q(x_a) \ln f_{a,\mathcal{G}}(x_a) & \text{if } \det(G_{ab}) = \det(G_{ba}) = 1 \ \forall b \in \partial a \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and $c(\mathcal{G}) = 0$ represents the vector of constraints where $c(\mathcal{G}) \doteq [c_{ab}(x_{ab}, x'_{ab}) : x_{ab}, x'_{ab}, (a, b) \in \mathcal{E}]$ and $c_{ab}(x_{ab}, x'_{ab}) \doteq G_{ab}(x_{ab}, x'_{ab}) - G_{ba}^{-1}(x'_{ab}, x_{ab})$. As mentioned above, $c_{ab}(x_{ab}, x'_{ab})$ is linear because

$$G_{ba}^{-1} = \frac{1}{\det(G_{ba})} \begin{bmatrix} G_{ba}(1, 1) & G_{ba}(0, 1) \\ -G_{ba}(1, 0) & G_{ba}(0, 0) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} G_{ba}(1, 1) & G_{ba}(0, 1) \\ -G_{ba}(1, 0) & G_{ba}(0, 0) \end{bmatrix}.$$

The remaining procedure to design an ADMM algorithm is exactly the same as described in Section 3.2 for (6).

4.3 Expressive power of gauge transformation

In the two preceding sections, we proposed a cross-entropy optimization over gauges aiming to make the transformed GM $p_G(x)$ as close to the given sampling distribution $q(x)$ as possible. Here, we would like to characterize the expressive power of the gauge transformation (for better sampling), thus posing the question: how much of the cross-entropy reduction is possible for given $p(x)$ and $q(x)$? We argue below that the ‘tight’ characterization of the gauge transformations stated in the following theorem is useful for answering the question.

Theorem 2 Given any GM, its gauge transformation p_G has to satisfy

$$p_G(x_{ab} = 0) \in [l_{ab}, u_{ab}], \quad \forall (a, b) \in \mathcal{E},$$

where l_{ab}, u_{ab} are eigenvalues of the 2×2 matrix, F , with components

$$F_{ab}(x'_{ab}, x''_{ab}) = \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{x_{\setminus ab}} f_a(x_a \setminus x'_{ab}) f_b(x_b \setminus x''_{ab}) \prod_{c \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{a, b\}} f_c(x_c), \quad (14)$$

where the summation is taken over the vector

$$x_{\setminus ab} = [x_{uv} : (u, v) \in \mathcal{E}, (u, v) \neq (a, b)]$$

and $x_a \setminus x'_{ab}$ is a vector with $x_{ab} = x'_{ab}$ fixed. The converse is also true: given $m_{ab} \in [l_{ab}, u_{ab}]$ for $(a, b) \in E$, there exists a gauge transformation into p_G such that

$$p_G(x_{ab} = 0) = m_{ab}, \quad \forall (a, b) \in \mathcal{E}.$$

Proof First, we prove the statement for a single edge (a, b) . Define $F_{ab, \mathcal{G}}$ for a gauge transformed GM with respect to $\mathcal{G}$ as in (14). Note that $F_{ab, \mathcal{G}}(0, 0) = p_G(x_{ab} = 0)$ by definition. Then we prove the following relationship:

$$F_{ab, \mathcal{G}} = G_{ab}^\top F_{ab} G_{ba}. \quad (15)$$

Assuming (15), it is straightforward to check that

$$p_G(x_{ab} = 0) \in [l_{ab}, u_{ab}].$$

by definition of the eigenvalues since $G_{ab}^\top = G_{ba}^{-1}$ and $\max_{v: \|v\|=1} v^\top F_{ab, \mathcal{G}} v$ equals the first eigenvalue of the matrix. Now we prove (15). To this end, one uses ‘skew-conditioning’ to generate a GM over graph $G^\dagger = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E} \setminus \{(a, b)\})$ with factors $f^\dagger$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} f_a^\dagger(x_a \setminus ab) &\leftarrow f(x_a \setminus x'_{ab}), & \forall x_a \setminus x'_{ab} \in \{0, 1\}^{\partial a \setminus b} \\ f_b^\dagger(x_b \setminus ab) &\leftarrow f(x_b \setminus x''_{ab}), & \forall x_b \setminus x'_{ab} \in \{0, 1\}^{\partial b \setminus a} \\ f_c^\dagger &\leftarrow f_c & \forall c \in \mathcal{V}, c \neq a, b, \end{aligned}$$

where $x_a \setminus ab$ is a subset of $x_a \setminus x'_{ab}$ with x'_{ab} excluded. Then $F_{ab, \mathcal{G}}(x'_{ab}, x''_{ab})$ equals to the partition function of the skew-conditioned GM. Moreover, since $\mathcal{G} \setminus \{G_{ab}, G_{ba}\}$ is a valid set of gauges over the GM, the partition function is invariant with respect to the gauge transformation of the original GM, i.e. $F_{ab, \mathcal{G}}$ is independent of the choice of $\mathcal{G} \setminus \{G_{ab}, G_{ba}\}$. Thus, without loss of generality one replaces $\mathcal{G} \setminus \{G_{ab}, G_{ba}\}$ by a set of identity matrices. Consequently, after simple calculations one arrives at (15). Finally, the proof extends to all $(a, b) \in \mathcal{E}$ since transformation of $F_{ab, \mathcal{G}}$ for each (a, b) is independent of the choice of $\mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{G}_{(a, b)}$. This completes the proof of the theorem. $\blacksquare$

The above theorem does not provide direct information how much $p_G(x)$ and $q(x)$ can be closed. Returning to the question of adjusting $q(x)$ to $p_G(x)$ to minimize the distance/cross-entropy, one can interpret Theorem 2 as suggesting to choose $q(x)$ such that

$$q(x_{ab} = 0) \in [l_{ab}, u_{ab}], \quad \forall (a, b) \in E.$$

However, notice that l_{ab}, u_{ab} are computationally intractable since their definitions require knowledge of the partition function Z . Nevertheless, one can try to estimate these values using some approximate methods in practice. We leave this suggestion for further exploration in the future.




Figure 1: Plots of the averaged log-partition approximation error vs varying parameter β over the complete graphs of size 4, 5 and 6, where the average is over 100 random models.




Figure 2: Plots of the averaged ratio of the log partition function estimated by Gauge-ADMMs to MF, where the average is over 100 random realizations 3-regular graphs (a) and grid graphs (b), vs size of the graph, i.e., the number of factors.

5. Experimental Results

5.1 Deterministic inference

We first measure the quality of lower bound estimations of the partition function in the Gauge-ADMM algorithm of Section 3.2. We choose to compare performance of the newly introduced algorithm with that of the most popular mean field (MF) method. This comparison is informative because both algorithms (ours and MF) provide lower bounds on the partition function. In accordance with what was mentioned at the end of Section 3.2, we evaluate not only performance of the base Gauge-ADMM, but also of the improved Gauge-ADMM accounting for contributions which have Hamming distance k from the base/zero configuration. We denote the respective improved Gauge-ADMM by Gauge-ADMM(k). In our experiments, we generate random GMs with factors dependent on $\{\beta_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{V}}$ parameters (akin inverse temperature) expressing the strength of interaction

$$f_a(x_a) = \exp(-\beta_a |h_0(x_a) - h_1(x_a)|), \quad (16)$$

where h_0 and h_1 count numbers of 0 and 1 contributions in x_a , respectively. We expect, intuitively, that as $|\beta_a|$ increases it becomes more difficult to approximate the partition function.

In the first set of experiments, we consider relatively small, complete graphs of varying sizes and draw components of the interactions strength vector, $\{\beta_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{V}}$, at random from the i.i.d. uniform distribution over the interval $[-T, T]$ for some $T > 0$, i.e., $\beta_a \sim \mathcal{U}[-T, T]$, for all $a \in \mathcal{V}$. For the performance measure, we use the log partition approximation error defined as $|\log Z - \log Z_{\text{LB}}|/|\log Z|$, where Z_{LB} is the output (i.e., lower bound of Z) from a respective algorithm. Note that since we consider relatively small graphs here computing the exact partition function, Z , is tractable. The results are illustrated in Figure 1. We observe that both MF and Gauge-ADMM perform worse for larger interaction length T . However, Gauge-ADMM suffers less and Gauge-ADMM(1) eventually outperforms MF as T grows. We observe (in accordance with a common sense expectation) that performance of Gauge-ADMM(k) improves significantly with increase in k , however on the expense of increasing complexity.

Note that the experiments described so far are performed on very densely connected graphs for which performance of MF is known to be very good Mézard et al. (1987); Parisi (1988); Mezard and Montanari (2009). Therefore, it is not surprising to see that the bare Gauge-ADMM is sometimes outperformed by MF. Since the complexity of Gauge-ADMMs depends on the sparsity of GM as mentioned in Section 3.2, we conjecture that Gauge-ADMM will outperform MF over sparse GMs. To verify this conjecture, we choose to experiment with larger 3-regular and planar grid graphs. In this case, computing the approximation error is impossible, we instead measure the ratio of the algorithm estimate for Z to the MF estimate, $\log(Z_{\text{LB}}/Z_{\text{MF}})$, where Z_{MF} is the output of MF and Z_{LB} is the lower bound provided by the respective Gauge-ADMM. Note that a larger value of the ratio indicates better performance (as compared to MF) since both algorithm provide lower bounds for Z . The results of this second set of experiments is summarized in Figure 2. We observe that Gauge-ADMM always significantly outperforms MF. For example, in the case of the 3-random regular GM built on 200 vertices (thus containing 300 variables) a Gauge-ADMM estimation for Z is more than e^{15} times larger than that of MF. However, in this case the relative gain provided by Gauge-ADMM(k) as k increase is not as significant as in the case of dense graphs discussed above. This observation implies that Gauge-ADMM is already sufficiently close to the true partition function in the case of sparse graphs.

5.2 Randomized inference

We compare performance of different Monte Carlo methods used in combination with the Gauge-ADMM algorithm defined in Section 4.2. Here, we compare rates of convergence of multiple independent Monte Carlo with and without using Gauge-ADMM. The experimental setup is as follows. First, one fixes a single instance of GM over 5×5 grid graph with factors generated at random in accordance with (16). Then, we apply Gauge-ADMM to minimize cross-entropy between given GM, p , and uniform distribution, q .

We experiment with two Monte Carlo methods: (vanilla) Importance Sampling (IS) and Annealed Importance Sampling (AIS), where the former is explained in Section 4.1. Experimenting with AIS uses a sequence of parameters $\gamma_0 = 0 < \gamma_1 < \dots < \gamma_{100} = 1$ for consecutive stages of annealing, and one transitions




Figure 3: Estimations of Importance Sampling vs the number of samples for 20 independent runs.




Figure 4: Estimations of Annealed Importance Sampling vs the number of samples for 20 independent runs.

between stages after a single iteration of the Gibbs sampler over the distributions $\{p^{\gamma_i} q^{1-\gamma_i}\}_{i=0,1,\dots,99}$, respectively. Consequently, the quality of estimation using AIS depends on cross entropy between adjacent distributions in each stage, i.e., $p^{\gamma_i} q^{1-\gamma_i}$ and $p^{\gamma_{i+1}} q^{1-\gamma_{i+1}}$. While one may run multiple Gauge-ADMMs to minimize the cross entropy at every stage, we just run a single Gauge-ADMM for minimizing the cross-entropy between p and q . This is because it is faster and also ‘squeeze’ down the cross-entropy between distributions of intermediate stages and improves the corresponding estimations.

As clearly seen in Figure 3 and Figure 4, each of the Monte Carlo runs converge much faster after Gauge-ADMM is applied. Notably, variances between different GM instances for IS and AIS runs for the original GM at 10^6 and 10^4 -th iterations, are roughly equivalent to the variances observed at 8.93×10^4 , 1.02×10^3 -th iterations for the transformed GM by Gauge-ADMM. One concludes that the Gauge-ADMM boosts convergence rate of both IS and AIS algorithms approximately ten times. We conjecture that the gain of Gauge-ADMM is even more significant for larger-scale GMs.²

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we explore freedom in Gauge Transformations and develop methods which allow to significantly improve the quality of partition function estimation. We believe that this approach provides a new angle on the approximate inference task, thus offering strong improvement opportunities in variety of applications involving GMs.

2. Notice, that checking the convergence of a MC method on large instances may be problematic because of a slow down of convergence.

References

- Interior Point Optimizer software library. URL <https://projects.coin-or.org/Ipopt>.
- JuMP - modeling language for mathematical optimization. URL <https://github.com/JuliaOpt/JuMP.jl>.
- Julia programming language. URL <http://julialang.org/>.
- Sung-Soo Ahn, Michael Chertkov, and Jinwoo Shin. Synthesis of mcmc and belief propagation. In *Advances In Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1453–1461, 2016.
- Ali Al-Bashabsheh and Yongyi Mao. Normal factor graphs and holographic transformations. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 57(2):752–763, 2011.
- José Bento, Nate Derbinsky, Javier Alonso-Mora, and Jonathan S Yedidia. A message-passing algorithm for multi-agent trajectory planning. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 521–529, 2013.
- H.A. Bethe. Statistical theory of superlattices. *Proceedings of Royal Society of London A*, 150:552, 1935.
- Vladimir Y Chernyak and Michael Chertkov. Loop calculus and belief propagation for q-ary alphabet: Loop tower. In *Information Theory, 2007. ISIT 2007. IEEE International Symposium on*, pages 316–320. IEEE, 2007.
- M. Chertkov. Lecture notes on “statistical inference in structured graphical models: Gauge transformations, belief propagation & beyond”, 2016.
- M. Chertkov and V. Chernyak. Loop calculus in statistical physics and information science. *Physical Review E*, 73:065102(R), 2006a.
- M. Chertkov and V. Chernyak. Loop series for discrete statistical models on graphs. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics*, page P06009, 2006b.
- Rina Dechter and Irina Rish. Mini-buckets: A general scheme for bounded inference. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 50(2):107–153, 2003.
- Stefano Ermon, Ashish Sabharwal, Bart Selman, and Carla P Gomes. Density propagation and improved bounds on the partition function. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2762–2770, 2012.
- G David Forney. Codes on graphs: Normal realizations. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 47(2):520–548, 2001.
- G David Forney Jr and Pascal O Vontobel. Partition functions of normal factor graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1102.0316*, 2011.
- William T Freeman, Egon C Pasztor, and Owen T Carmichael. Learning low-level vision. *International journal of computer vision*, 40(1):25–47, 2000.
- Daniel Gabay and Bertrand Mercier. A dual algorithm for the solution of nonlinear variational problems via finite element approximation. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, 2(1):17–40, 1976.
- Robert Gallager. Low-density parity-check codes. *IRE Transactions on information theory*, 8(1):21–28, 1962.
- Amir Globerson and Tommi S Jaakkola. Approximate inference using conditional entropy decompositions. In *AISTATS*, pages 130–138, 2007.

- Mark Jerrum and Alistair Sinclair. Polynomial-time approximation algorithms for the ising model. *SIAM Journal on computing*, 22(5):1087–1116, 1993.
- Michael Irwin Jordan. *Learning in graphical models*, volume 89. Springer Science & Business Media, 1998.
- S. Kirkpatrick, C. D. Gelatt Jr, and M. P. Vecchi. Optimization by simulated annealing. *Science*, 220(4598): 671–680, 1983.
- Frank R. Kschischang and Brendan J. Frey. Iterative decoding of compound codes by probability propagation in graphical models. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, 16(2):219–230, 1998.
- Lek-Heng Lim. Singular values and eigenvalues of tensors: a variational approach. In *Computational Advances in Multi-Sensor Adaptive Processing, 2005 1st IEEE International Workshop on*, pages 129–132. IEEE, 2005.
- Jun S Liu. *Monte Carlo strategies in scientific computing*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- Qiang Liu and Alexander T Ihler. Bounding the partition function using holder’s inequality. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-11)*, pages 849–856, 2011.
- Qiang Liu and Alexander T Ihler. Negative tree reweighted belief propagation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1203.3494*, 2012.
- Andrew W Marshall. The use of multi-stage sampling schemes in monte carlo computations. Technical report, DTIC Document, 1954.
- Nicholas Metropolis and Stanislaw Ulam. The monte carlo method. *Journal of the American statistical association*, 44(247):335–341, 1949.
- Marc Mezard and Andrea Montanari. *Information, Physics, and Computation*. Oxford University Press, Inc., New York, NY, USA, 2009. ISBN 019857083X, 9780198570837.
- Marc Mézard, Georgio Parisi, and M. A. Virasoro. *Spin Glass Theory and Beyond*. Singapore: World Scientific, 1987.
- Ryuhei Mori. Holographic transformation, belief propagation and loop calculus for generalized probabilistic theories. In *Information Theory (ISIT), 2015 IEEE International Symposium on*, pages 1099–1103. IEEE, 2015.
- Radford M Neal. Annealed importance sampling. *Statistics and Computing*, 11(2):125–139, 2001.
- A. Owen and Y. Zhou. Safe and effective importance sampling. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 95:135–143, 2000.
- Giorgio Parisi. Statistical field theory, 1988.
- Judea Pearl. *Reverend Bayes on inference engines: A distributed hierarchical approach*. Cognitive Systems Laboratory, School of Engineering and Applied Science, University of California, Los Angeles, 1982.
- Judea Pearl. *Probabilistic reasoning in intelligent systems: networks of plausible inference*. Morgan Kaufmann, 2014.
- H.A. Peierls. Ising’s model of ferromagnetism. *Proceedings of Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 32:477–481, 1936.
- Reuven Y Rubinstein. Optimization of computer simulation models with rare events. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 99(1):89–112, 1997.

- Nicholas Ruozzi. The bethe partition function of log-supermodular graphical models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 117–125, 2012.
- E.B. Sudderth, M.J. Wainwright, and A.S. Willsky. Loop series and bethe variational bounds in attractive graphical models. In *Proceedings of NIPS 2007*, 2007.
- Leslie G Valiant. Holographic algorithms. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 37(5):1565–1594, 2008.
- Andreas Wächter and Lorenz T Biegler. On the implementation of an interior-point filter line-search algorithm for large-scale nonlinear programming. *Mathematical programming*, 106(1):25–57, 2006.
- M. J. Wainwright and M. I. Jordan. Graphical models, exponential families, and variational inference. Technical Report 649, UC Berkeley, Department of Statistics, 2003. URL <http://www.eecs.berkeley.edu/~wainwrig/Papers/WaiJorVariational03.pdf>.
- M. J. Wainwright and M. I. Jordan. Graphical models, exponential families, and variational inference. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 1(1):1–305, 2008.
- Martin J Wainwright, Tommi S Jaakkola, and Alan S Willsky. A new class of upper bounds on the log partition function. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 51(7):2313–2335, 2005.
- M.J. Wainwright, T.S. Jaakkola, and A.S. Willsky. Tree-based reparametrization framework for approximate estimation on graphs with cycles. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 49(5):1120–1146, 2003.
- Yu Wang, Wotao Yin, and Jinshan Zeng. Global convergence of admm in nonconvex nonsmooth optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.06324*, 2015.
- Adrian Weller, Kui Tang, Tony Jebara, and David Sontag. Understanding the bethe approximation: when and how can it go wrong? In *UAI*, pages 868–877, 2014.
- Wim Wiegerinck. Approximations with reweighted generalized belief propagation. In *AISTATS*, 2005.
- J. S. Yedidia, W. T. Freeman, and Y. Weiss. Constructing free-energy approximations and generalized belief propagation algorithms. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 51(7):2282–2312, 2005.
- Jonathan S Yedidia, William T Freeman, and Yair Weiss. Bethe free energy, kikuchi approximations, and belief propagation algorithms. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 13, 2001.